

planning through the United Nations Population Fund.

UNFPA has been and continues to be a leader in the renewed commitment of the world community to stabilize global population and improve the status of women. UNFPA is the world's largest internationally funded provider of family planning and reproductive health services. UNFPA serves women, children, and families in 160 developing countries around the world where health care structures are fragile and unable to address the specific health needs of mothers and children.

By funding UNFPA this year, in 1 year alone, 870,000 women will not be deprived of effective contraceptives; more than 520,000 women will be provided with health care support; and there will not be 500,000 unwanted pregnancies. There will not be 1,200 additional maternal deaths, 22,000 additional infant deaths, and 15,000 additional life-threatening illnesses and injuries to mothers during pregnancy and childbirth.

So, on this day, March 8, International Women's Day, I am proud to introduce this bill, which will help bring equality to women everywhere and certainly help save lives.

POWER IN WASHINGTON OR POWER AT HOME?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, about this time, President Bush is landing in the Dakotas for his first visit to my part of the country. He is landing in Fargo tonight and will be proceeding to South Dakota tomorrow. I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that as he makes that landing there, that today we have passed the cornerstone of his tax plan: reduction in marginal rates and real tax relief for working families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the start of what I think will be a great debate to have in this Congress, and that is, who has the power? Does Washington, D.C. have the power, or do the American people have the power? Because the more of this that Washington takes from the American people, the less they have to spend. The more of this that Washington takes, the more power Washington has, and the less power the American family has.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate about whether we want to consolidate power in Washington or whether we want to distribute power back to our families, individuals, and communities. We have heard a debate today about whether or not to spend the surplus, and our friends on the other side have raised concerns about whether or not we ought to be proceeding down this track. Well, Mr. Speaker, the same

people who are making that argument have no such constraint when it comes to spending the surplus on new government programs. That is an entirely different argument that they make.

If we look at the arguments that are made by the opponents of the President's proposal, they really revolve around a couple of basic points. One is that it is too big in the actual size of this tax cut. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we look at it in terms of actual size as a percentage of the total surplus, it is about one-quarter of that surplus, or 6 percent of government revenues over the course of the next 10 years. So in terms of actual size, I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very responsible number in that it recognizes the commitment that we have to protecting Social Security and Medicare, paying down the Federal debt, and making those necessary investments that are critical to our future, and at the same time, it allows us to get some of that money back into the hands of the American people.

What about the proportional size of this tax cut? Well, if we look at it relative to previous tax cuts, during the Reagan administration, during the Kennedy administration, it is about half the size of the Kennedy tax cuts, and about one-third of the size of the Reagan tax cuts, as a percentage of the gross domestic product and also as a percentage of total government revenues. So proportionally, Mr. Speaker, I would argue as well that this is a balanced and responsible way to go about giving the American people more of their hard-earned money.

Well, the other question is, what about spending? Are we going to be able to have those resources that are necessary? Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal sets aside \$1 trillion for contingencies. I care about agriculture in my part of the country. The President has said we recognize there are going to be emergencies that are necessary to come up with additional dollars. So he has accounted for that in the form of a contingency fund of about \$1 trillion. Government spending is going to increase 4 percent this next year on the discretionary side; that is the part that the Congress appropriates, and if we add in the total amount of entitlement spending combined, it is about \$100 billion over this year's funding levels. That is a significant amount of additional spending. Four percent is higher than the proposed rate of inflation for this next year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would also say that if we look at it in relative amounts and what it does to allow us to continue to make the investments that we need to make, this plan enables us to do that.

The other argument that is often made, Mr. Speaker, and if we listen to the grim reapers and the prophets of

doom, is that the Reagan tax cuts led to the deficits. The fact is, that is not true. After the Reagan tax cuts in 1981, government revenues went up, but the rate of spending exceeded that. Congress could not control, curb, its appetite to spend those dollars; and that, Mr. Speaker, is what led to the deficits during those years. In fact, if Congress had been able to control its spending and only spent at a rate of 5.6 percent average increase per year between 1981 and 1991, the budget would have been balanced in 1991, instead of just a few years ago.

So as we engage in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people will listen clearly and understand that this is a great day for the American taxpayers. I am proud to be able to vote in favor of allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. It is good for the American taxpayers, it is good for the people of South Dakota, and tomorrow will be a day of celebration as the President makes this stop in my great State; and I hope that we will be able to welcome him and deliver to him a message that we care about the people of this country, about the taxpayers, and about giving them more freedom and more liberty.

PROUD TO SUPPORT THE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today proud to have supported the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001. With an economy sputtering, the time is now for us to act proactively and implement a reasonable and fair tax relief package that will benefit our hard-working, middle-class families and small businesses.

In New York's First Congressional District, where the cost of living is higher than in many regions of our Nation, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001 will jump start our local economy and put the money back where it belongs: in the pockets of the taxpayers. They created the tax surplus; they should get it back.

This much-needed tax relief will be put to better use by offsetting costs for our families, costs like a college education for a young person, a mortgage payment, or they will be able to support our small businesses and our local economy. Those middle-class working families earning \$50,000 will see a \$1,600 tax cut in their taxes. That is a 50 percent cut. A family of 4 earning \$35,000 would see 100 percent tax cut. Now, that is fair. And that is reasonable tax relief, and that is real tax relief for middle-class working families.

In addition, this tax package will leave more money in New York State.